

GLM/RCF:ach 4/1/04 # 303296.1  
PATENT

Attorney Reference Number 3382-65526  
Application Number 09/475,319

### REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. New claims 44-60 are pending in the application. Claims 44, 56, 57, 65, and 66 are independent. No claims have been allowed.

### Amendments

Applicants have canceled claims 1-7, 9-19, 21-33, and 35-43 without prejudice, and now present new claims 44-66. The amendments are not for reasons related to patentability of any of the respective claims. Rather, Applicants wish to refocus prosecution. No new matter is entered by these amendments.

### Cited Art

The Action cites the following references: Adams et al. ("Adams", US 6,237,030); Staab ("Staab", US 5,498,334); Morimura et al ("Morimura" US 6,072,474); and Matthews, III et al. ("Matthews", US 6,344,865).

### 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The earlier claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams in view of Staab; under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams in view of Staab and further in view of Morimura; and under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams in view of Staab and further in view of Matthews.

Applicants respectfully submit the new claims 44-66 are allowable over the cited art. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. (MPEP § 2142.)

GLM/RCF:ach 4/1/04 # 303296.1  
PATENT

Attorney Reference Number 3382-65526  
Application Number 09/475,319

*Claim 44*

Independent claim 44 recites in part:

simultaneously displaying the web pages indicated by the stored network addresses, wherein the displaying navigates to the at least one scroll position indicated by the configuration settings for the at least one of the web pages indicated by the stored network addresses;

For example, the Application describes at page 23, lines 16 et seq.:

As previously noted, the configuration settings may comprise, but are not limited to, the number of display panes, the relative size and position of the display panes and the position of the scroll bars 256 and 262 for each of the panes.

Adams and Staab, individually and collectively, fail to teach or suggest "the displaying navigates to the at least one scroll position indicated by the configuration settings." According to MPEP 706.02(j), the prior art references must "teach or suggest all the claim limitations." This requirement is not met, and, therefore, Claim 44 should be allowed.

*If the concurrently displayed web pages of Adams were combined with Staab's TopDesk system, the result would not be "the displaying navigates to the at least one scroll position indicated by the configuration settings" as recited in claim 44.* At column 11, lines 6 et seq., Adams states:

Selecting provide all displayed links 102 will allow a predetermining [sic] group of web pages to be displayed concurrently.

Thus, Adams does describe displaying web pages concurrently. However, Adams does not describe the recited "scroll position."

The Action further relies on Staab. Staab indicates at column 5, lines 44 et seq.:

The TopDesk system persistently stores the size, location, and associated window title of each ghost window.

Thus, Staab does describe storing a size, location, and window title. However, Staab does not describe "navigates to the at least one scroll position indicated by the configuration settings." Further, Applicants find no teaching or suggestion within Adams or Staab to so modify Adam's system so that it would navigate "to the at least one scroll position indicated by the configuration settings."

For at least these reasons, claim 44, its dependent claims 45-55, and similarly worded claim 56 are allowable over Adams and Staab. Further, Applicants do not find additional relevant disclosure in Morimura or Matthews. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request allowance of these claims.

GLM/RCF:neh 4/1/04 # 303296.1  
PATENT

Attorney Reference Number 3382-65526  
Application Number 09/475,319

**Claim 57**

Claim 57 recites in part:

simultaneously re-displaying the plurality of web pages, wherein the re-displaying displays a portion of at least one of the subsequently requested versions of the plurality of web pages corresponding to the user-selected portion of the at least one of the web pages as indicated by the display configuration settings.

For example, the Application describes at Page 14, lines 13,

By re-positioning the vertical scroll bar 262 and the horizontal scroll bar 256, as well as re-sizing the display pane 212b, the display area of the display pane 212b in Figure 3 is focused on a user-selected portion of the Copyright Office's web page. ... As will be described in further detail below, the positions of the vertical scroll bar 262 and the horizontal scroll bar 256 can be saved, and then quickly and automatically recalled during future Internet sessions ...

Adams and Staab, individually and collectively, fail to teach or suggest "the re-displaying displays a portion of at least one of the subsequently requested versions of the plurality of web pages corresponding to the user-selected portion of the at least one of the web pages as indicated by the display configuration settings." According to MPEP 706.02(j), the prior art references must "teach or suggest all the claim limitations." This requirement is not met, and, therefore, Claim 57 should be allowed.

*If the concurrently displayed web pages of Adams were combined with Staab's TopDesk system, the result would not be "the re-displaying displays a portion of at least one of the subsequently requested versions of the plurality of web pages corresponding to the user-selected portion of the at least one of the web pages as indicated by the display configuration settings" as recited in claim 57.*

At column 11, lines 6 et seq., Adams states:

Selecting provide all displayed links 102 will allow a predetermining group of web pages to be displayed concurrently.

Thus, Adams does describe displaying web pages concurrently. However, Adams does not describe the recited "the re-displaying displays a portion of at least one of the subsequently requested versions of the plurality of web pages corresponding to the user-selected portion of the at least one of the web pages as indicated by the display configuration settings."

The Action further relies on Staab. Staab indicates at column 5, lines 44 et seq.:

The TopDesk system persistently stores the size, location, and associated

GLM/RCF:uch 4/1/04 # 303296.1  
PATENT

Attorney Reference Number 3382-65526  
Application Number 09/475,319

window title of each ghost window.

Thus, Staab does describe storing a size, location, and window title. However, Staab does not describe "the re-displaying displays a portion of at least one of the subsequently requested versions of the plurality of web pages corresponding to the user-selected portion of the at least one of the web pages as indicated by the display configuration settings." Further, Applicants find no teaching or suggestion within Adams or Staab to so modify Adam's system so that it would operate in such a manner.

For at least these reasons, claim 57, its dependent claims 58-64, and similarly worded claim 65 are allowable over Adams and Staab. Further, Applicants do not find additional relevant disclosure in Morimura or Matthews. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request allowance of these claims.

#### *Request for Interview*

If any issues remain, the Examiner is formally requested to contact the undersigned attorney prior to issuance of the next Office Action in order to arrange a telephonic interview. It is believed that a brief discussion of the merits of the present application may expedite prosecution. Applicants submit the foregoing formal Amendment so that the Examiner may fully evaluate Applicants' position, thereby enabling the interview to be more focused.

This request is being submitted under MPEP § 713.01, which indicates that an interview may be arranged in advance by a written request.

GLM/RCP:ach 4/1/04 # 303296.1  
PATENT

Attorney Reference Number 3382-65526  
Application Number 09/475,319


**Conclusion**

In light of the foregoing remarks, the claims should be allowable. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

By

  
Gregory L. Maurer  
Registration No. 43,781

One World Trade Center, Suite 1600  
121 S.W. Salmon Street  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
Telephone: (503) 226-7391  
Facsimile: (503) 228-9446